

REMARKS

The Examiner's participation in the interview on January 11, 2006 has been appreciated. Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's assistance during the prosecution of this case. At this time, further consideration of this application in view of the claim amendments and following comments respectfully is requested. Claims 4 and 5 have been added to describe the cutting means as mechanical in nature. This description was discussed with the Examiner. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and figures as originally filed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The August 23, 2005 Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated either by Inoue et al. (US 5,423,931) or Ward (US 3,735,911). From our discussion with the Examiner during the January 11, 2006 interview, it is understood that agreement was reached that neither Inoue et al. nor Ward anticipates original claims 1-3. The Examiner also indicated that amending the claims to indicate that the cutting means is *mechanical* further would distinguish the claims from these, and other documents applied in the August 23, 2005 Action. Hence, based on the discussion, Applicants have added claims 4 and 5 to define the cutting means as mechanical

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is directed to solving the problems of the prior art, i.e. uneven, deformed, and non-uniform electrodes formed on semiconductor chips. The prior art means of forming electrodes on semiconductor chips by cutting the "wiskers" using heat, fire, lasers, and the like, do not result in electrodes reliably having uniform heights without deformities, as is required of the cutting means according to the claimed invention. Since the prior art does not teach or suggest a flip chip bonder with a cutting device that reliably produces electrodes uniform in height, the claimed invention is unobvious.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application 10/820,853. Specifically, the Examiner deemed that it would have been obvious that a machine for processing a plate like workpiece with electrodes having the same structure would be capable of processing a flip chip.

Applicants respectfully request this rejection remain in abeyance until an indication of allowable subject matter.

Request for Interview

The Examiner offered that she would initiate a further telephone interview should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: January 17, 2006

1850 M Street, NW, #800
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329